UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Religious Revolution in India: A Westerner's Interpretation - - *James H. Cousins*

Not Peace at Any Price - - *Edith Hunter*

Gandhi's Silent Revolution - - - - - - - - *Haridas T. Muzumdar*

Jawaharlal Nehru—*George Linnaeus Thompson*

For Neutrality and Against Isolation - - - - - - - - - - *A. J. Muste*

Partition of Palestine - - *Taraknath Das*

Japanese Honor Great Americans—*W. B. Bullen*

VOLUME CXX NUMBER 5

Chicago, November 1, 1937

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice — *Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL
Notes 71
Jottings—J. H. H. 73
ARTICLES—
Religious Revolution in India: A Westerner's Interpretation—JAMES H. COUSINS 74
Not Peace at Any Price—EDITH HUNTER 75
Gandhi's Silent Revolution—HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR 76
Jawaharlal Nehru—GEORGE LINNAEUS THOMPSON 77
Our Brethren the Trees—MIRA 78
For Neutrality and Against Isolation—A. J. MUSTE 79
Partition of Palestine—TARAKNATH DAS 80
Japanese Honor Great Americans—W. B. BULLEN 81
THE STUDY TABLE—
For Students of Indian Affairs—TARAKNATH DAS 82
Anthologies of the Spirit—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 82
Selected Readings from the Bible—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 83
The New Testament—C. A. HAWLEY 83
CORRESPONDENCE—
New Deal or Third Party?—VICTOR S. YARROS 84
THE FIELD—
Are Christians Against Prohibition?—M. K. GANDHI 70
Jawaharlal Nehru on Despatch of Indian Troops to China—*India Bulletin* 84

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Are Christians Against Prohibition?

By M. K. GANDHI

Having received protests from Christian correspondents against prohibition, I asked Mahadev Desai to write to a few representative Christian friends to ascertain their views on the question. Here are two answers. Shri P. O. Phillip, Indian Secretary of the National Christian Council of India, writes:

"I am not surprised to hear that a number of Christian friends are writing to you to say that 'the policy of prohibition trenches upon their privilege to drink.' I may not be far wrong thinking that most of the correspondents who write to you in that strain are Roman Catholics or those brought up in Anglo-Catholic traditions. Roman Catholic Christianity came to India from Latin countries and is even today dominated by Latin culture. People in Latin countries drink the common wine because in olden days it was not safe to drink water. The Roman Catholic missionaries who came to India, though celibates and given to the simple life, carried with them this national habit of theirs, and the people who accepted their religion naturally followed the example of their priests. There is thus no social or religious disapproval among Roman Catholics in India in regard to drinking in moderation as there is among Muslims and higher caste Hindus. Among Protestant Christians the attitude toward drink is different.

Though Protestant missionaries come to India mostly from Teutonic countries where beer is the common drink and where there is no taboo on the use of wine, they are generally total abstainers and have taught their Indian converts also to be total abstainers. The result is that the use of alcoholic drink even in moderation is looked upon with social and religious disapprobation among Protestant Christian communities.

Among Roman Catholics also there is awakening to the evils of drink. While the authorities of the Catholic Church may officially maintain that there is nothing wrong in drinking in moderation, they cannot shut their eyes to the moral and economic ruin that drink is causing among their people. Drinking even in moderation, when once started, has the fatal tendency to become drunkenness in many, especially among the ignorant and backward.

As a Christian Indian I rejoice that the Congress Ministries have placed prohibition in the very forefront of their program. In the past, few British and American missionaries lent support to the anti-drink campaign of the Congress, under the mistaken notion that it was adopted only to harass the British Government and not from a genuine desire for reform. Unfor-

(*Continued on page* 84)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXX MONDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1937 No. 5

PRAYER FOR MY COUNTRY

Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high;
Where knowledge is free;
Where the world has not been broken up into fragments by narrow domestic walls;
Where words come out from the depths of truth;
Where tireless striving stretches its arms towards perfection;
Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into the dreary desert sand of dead habit;
Where the mind is led forward by Thee into ever-widening thought and action.
Into that heaven of freedom, my Father, let my country awake.

Rabindranath Tagore.

THESE AUTUMN DAYS

Let's be cheerful for a change! Let's talk about autumn and its glories! William Cullen Bryant found nothing cheerful about this season. He spoke of the autumn days as "the melancholy days" and characterized them as "the saddest of the year." Thomson, in his *Seasons,* speaks of "the pale descending year," yet finds it "pleasing still." John Keats, in his immortal ode, has no doubt of the mood which autumn should inspire, for he speaks gladly of the

> "Season of mists and mellow fruitfulness!
> Close bosom-friend of the maturing sun!"

And thinking of "the songs of Spring," he exclaims at once, "Thou hast thy music too." Wordsworth, in the same happy spirit, celebrates "Autumn's soft, shadowy days," and uses them as the symbol of all "loveliness." But Spenser outvies them all in cries of jubilation. He sings of "autumn all in splendor clad,"

> "Laden with fruits that made him laugh, full glad
> That he had banished hunger,"

and describes at length the season's "jollities." We imagine—to be philosophical for a moment!—that our reaction upon the autumn days all depends upon our point of view. If this point of view is relative, depending upon the summer behind and the winter before, then we are likely to be sad, for autumn marks the transition from the warmth, the beauty, the freedom of the summer to the grim terrors of the winter. That was what Bryant was thinking about! But if our point of view is absolute, then we see autumn for herself alone, and find the season indeed beyond compare. The bracing air, the cloudless sky, the clear, cool days, the stilly, frosty nights, the fields bursting with plenty, the trees flaming with glory—this is the time when the step is quickened, the heart lifted, and life begun anew. Curious that we should think of the spring as the time when life awakens! It *is* in nature, but *not* in man. As the spring days pass, man grows tired, languid, restless—he wants to drop his work and become suddenly idle. But in the autumn—ah, how the blood leaps in the veins, how energy moves to action and thought to speech! Yesterday, in the hot summer days, we wanted to forget everything—the world was too much for us! But now, in this quickening air of autumn—come on, give us your problems. We can do anything! So be glad! Life is good! The world is ours!

WHICH WAY?

The still continuing discussion which has followed upon President Roosevelt's sensational Chicago speech has served an immensely useful service. It has clarified the situation of this country in relation to the warring world as showing the two ways, and none other, in which as a people we may walk. On the one hand is the neutrality policy as defined by the Neutrality Law, under which the United States is supposed to operate in time of war. This policy prescribes that America shall definitely keep out of any and all wars by declaring itself neutral as regards the belligerents. It is based upon the idea that the way to keep out of war is to *keep out.* Its logic is of course isolation, and the protection of our own security at any cost to the rest of humankind. The President's speech in Chicago, followed by Secretary Hull's naming of Japan as "the aggressor nation" in Asia, explains why the Neutrality Law has not been put into effect. The administration is opposed to it, and thus breaks completely with Congress on this central issue of foreign affairs. On the other hand is the policy of making the peace-and-war interests of the world our own, and thus taking sides, at least with our influence and sympathy, with those nations in any war, which are upholding democracy and civilization. This policy is based upon the proposition that, when the world is stricken, we are stricken too, and that if another World War comes along, we

will be involved whether we will or no. Since we don't want war, the logical thing to do is to anticipate it and prevent it by joining hands with countries like-minded with ourselves and against the gangster nations which are the menace to world peace. Our only hope, in other words, is a concert, or alliance, or league of powers which can establish and maintain law in international relations. President Roosevelt's Chicago speech was enormously important because, in this critical hour, it committed America definitely to this latter policy—at least, until Congress speaks! In contrasting these two policies, we feel a very simple and definite reaction. It is this! The alliance policy has been tried —by Woodrow Wilson in 1917, for the same reasons now spoken by Mr. Roosevelt—and it failed. We should like to see the neutrality policy tried, lest possibly it might succeed.

HURRAH FOR WAR!

Nicholas Murray Butler is spoiling for another fight! A perfect pacifist in peace-times, seventy-five years old, the father of one daughter and no sons, he is all for war the moment old Mars lifts anywhere his "grim-visaged front". So far as the official record is concerned, Dr. Butler is the greatest of all peace leaders. President of the American Board of Conciliation Internationale, President of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Chairman year after year of the Lake Mohonk Conferences on International Arbitration, member of innumerable foreign societies, decorated by dozens of foreign governments, winner (with Jane Addams) of the Nobel Peace Prize, this man is all for peace when there is peace, but let wars or rumors of wars come along, and he marches straightway with the militarists. When the World War broke out, he was so stunned that he remained immovable in his pacifist convictions for a time. But only for a time! As the war went on, and the band-wagon of arms rolled by, Butler climbed promptly aboard. (It is difficult to imagine Nicholas Murray Butler missing any band-wagons!) In a short time he was one of the most belligerent advocates of America's participation in the War—under the cloak, of course, of fighting for democracy and civilization! When we finally went in, Butler led all the stay-at-homes in passionate devotion to slaughter. Unable himself to reach the enemy, he struck at the pacifists on his faculty as the nearest mark, and did a complete job of elimination. With the return of peace, Butler was again a pacifist, and an ardent one. But now he is smelling blood again. The battle is on in Europe and Asia, and like an old war-horse he sniffs it from afar. The excuse for fighting is again democracy and civilization, now threatened by the Fascists as yesterday they were threatened by the "Huns". "The challenge to believers in liberty," says Butler, "is imperative and instant. The attempt of the dictator to extend his authority over other lands and other peoples must be met and faced by free peoples. . . . There is no other way in which the paradox of despotism can be brought to an end. . . . Neutrality would be immorality." So all up for war! We must save the world again! The fighting pacifist is at large —and hell hath no fury like a pacifist aroused!

THE GOOD OF JUSTICE BLACK

There was much of genuine calamity in the Black case—calamity for the President, the Supreme Court, and the country. Now that the excitement is over and the issue closed, it seems agreed that the President would not have appointed the Alabama Senator had he known the facts; that the Senate would not have confirmed him; and that Black himself, from the standpoint of all standards of character and judicial fitness, should never have been raised to the Supreme Bench. But good comes out of evil! This calamity has its beneficent side in at least two respects. In the first place, the new Justice is "on the spot." He has professed unreserved devotion to the Bill of Rights in repudiation of his Klan affiliations, and now for the whole period of his service as judge will be watched by millions of eyes to see if he exemplifies this devotion. Though he live to be as old as Methuselah and serve through all these years on the Court, he will still be under scrutiny. Therefore, of all the judges, is Black likely to be the most impeccable in his fidelity to human rights under the Constitution. Let cases affecting Jews, Negroes, Catholics come before the Court, and we may be sure that Black, fixed by the alert stare of his wakeful countrymen, must come through "clean" in his protection of these minorities. So, apart from the shame of the appointment, there is gain rather than loss in its actual outcome. But there is a second good side to this misfortune! We refer to the fact that, through all the years of his service on the Supreme Bench, Justice Black will stand as a living memorial to President Roosevelt's attempt to pack the Court. *This* is what it all came to—that nefarious attempt of the Executive to lay hands upon a coördinate branch of government and subdue it to his purposes! This Ku-Kluxer, sitting there dispensing justice—in him we behold the logic of all that was really involved in the court-packing scheme! Year will pass into year, perhaps decade into decade, and still that black-robed memorial will endure, until at last history has taken over the tale and recorded for all time the one most tragic episode of the Rooseveltian era. Thus does the moral law work its awful judgments. In the end our world is rendered safe against all betrayal by the righteousness which lies perpetually at the heart of reality.

INSPIRING SPECTACLES?!

The hard-mugged Mussolini standing shoulder to shoulder with the soft-faced Hitler in review of armed hordes of Nazi troopers! * * * Mr. Justice Black boarding at the last moment in England an insignificant steamer, in a vain endeavor to get back to this country without being seen. * * * Two trained nurses in a hospital refusing to nurse a man badly injured in an automobile accident, because it was an insurance case, and they wouldn't get their money "for years." * * * Homer Martin, head of the U. A. W., receiving a delegation of protesting trade unionists in his shirt sleeves, a dangling cigarette in the corner of his mouth, and a loaded revolver in his hand. * * * Franco's troopers kicking to death with their hob-nailed shoes a sergeant who had deserted to the enemy and been recaptured. * * * The pretty little damsels with their blood-stained finger-nails and toeless shoes, and the ugly old dames who have the same. * * * Four old men in Bethel, Maine, 79, 79, 82 and 84 years old, respectively, smashed to death in an automobile through fast driving. * * * The new "bomber" developed by the United States Navy, weighing 50 tons and with a flying range of 8,000 miles. * * * The announcement of Charles J. Paunill, President of the Radiomarine Corporation of America, that "television's greatest service would be in military use." * * * The C. I. O. at Atlantic City passing a resolution actually promising to keep its contracts! * * * The Episcopalians at their Cincinnati Convention refusing to change their divorce canon. * * * The Mufti of Jerusalem, head of the Moslem faith in Palestine, fleeing in peasant disguise, and armed with a revolver. * * * An 18-year old boy of South Paris, Maine, killing for money a frail old woman and her venerated husband, a country doctor, by strangulation, and cramming the bodies into an automobile for safe-keeping. * * * These items disclose a sad, even a terrible world. They could be multiplied, alas, almost indefinitely. But are these the whole of life? Are there not items in the daily news as truly inspiring as these are depressing? We propose to keep watch and see what happens.

FUNERALS AND THE NEWSPAPERS

A distinguished American was buried the other day. Many times a millionaire, this man had lived in the state which his income made possible. His funeral was held in one of New York's most gorgeous churches. Two thousand persons crowded the sanctuary. A blanket of orchids and lilies-of-the-valley covered the casket; other flowers filled the chancel. Shortly before the service, an American Legion guard marched down the aisle and placed banners to left and right of the bier. A few minutes later a Coast Guard detail marched to their appointed places. A choir of forty boys and twenty men, led by a crucifer, headed the processional, which contained two rectors and accompanying clergy. Some thirty or more honorary pall-bearers crowded the front pews. Anthems and chants interspersed the reading of the burial service and the saying of the prayers. All this seemed to us to be not unfitting in the case of one who had held high public office and moved in social ranks of exalted prestige. What irritated us was the announcement in the newspapers the next morning that the services were "severely simple." Will somebody please tell us why this cant must be hypocritically furnished forth every time a funeral, ornate or otherwise, is held? If *this* funeral was "simple," will somebody else please tell us what would be elaborate? As a matter of fact this particular burial was as ceremonious as careful planning could make it. Every resource of church and state was utilized to made it impressive. Thousands of dollars were expended to insure its beauty. And why not, if the family and friends thus desired to do honor to the dead? Is there no place for pomp in this usually drab life of ours? Is it not worth pondering when a city like New York cares enough about the dead to pause for a moment, in its greedy and vulgar haste, to pay ceremonial tribute to his memory? What was done at this funeral may or may not have been in good taste. Who shall judge? What is intolerable is the newspaper gush about "simplicity," with its insulting implication that the mourners should have done what they deliberately chose not to do.

Jottings

> ". . . after cheering the exhortations of their leaders, the militant union men sang songs about the starvation of workers, climbed into their automobiles, and drove off."—Despatch in the New York *Times*

These workers evidently prefer automobiles to bread. Well, if you can't have both, who wouldn't take automobiles?

At last, Paradise has been located! The place is called Aqua Escondida, a small town in a remote section of Guatemala. Visiting there, Dr. Robert Redfield, of the University of Chicago, found that the inhabitants had never heard of the Dionne quintuplets, Col. Lindbergh, or the Duke of Windsor and Wally Simpson.

Here's another Paradise—the little country of Luxembourg, which has an army of 176 men, and 5 unemployed! But if all of us went there, the army would straightway become a million and the unemployed hundreds of thousands. The curse of the world is nationalistic *elephantiasis.*

The Lindberghs have gone to England; now the Duke and Duchess of Windsor are coming to America. This looks, on the whole, like a fair publicity exchange.

General Pershing's American Legion speech warned against Communism in this country, but said not a word against Fascism. There spoke the true soldier!

A Russian fleet years ago stirred the world's contempt by bombarding (by mistake) an English fishing fleet. A Japanese submarine today stirs the world's horror by bombarding (by intention) a Chinese fishing fleet. We suppose this marks some kind of progress, but we cannot make out just what.

J. H. H.

Religious Revolution in India: A Westerner's Interpretation

JAMES H. COUSINS*

It may perhaps serve the good cause of mutual understanding between East and West if an Irish Protestant who has been an educator in India for twenty years, and who was in the capital city, Trivandrum, at the time of the Proclamation by the Maharaja of Travancore which opened the Hindu temples of that State to worshippers of all castes and of no caste, should offer an interpretation of an event which has attracted world-wide attention.

Historically, the event is normal, though the wave-length of history in India is generally longer than it is elsewhere; and the sequelae of the present movement in the spiritual life of India (and perhaps outside India, as I shall indicate), though it may look like religious revolution, will become part of the accepted order of things in a short time.

Hindu orthodoxy, it should be remembered, is an imposition by about 5 per cent of three hundred millions on a population that is inherently devotional. Between the ceremonial service of the Brahmin minority and the universally recognized validity of personal religious experience in the vast mass of the people, there has been an age-long interaction. Hindu orthodoxy is a slow-moving stream of heterodoxies. The sacred mantram (slogan) that is given to the Brahmin boy on his initiation into Brahmanhood (the Gayatri or Savitur) was originated by a non-Brahman. The God Krishna, universally worshipped, was born into the second caste (Kshattriya, rulers and protectors). There are saints venerated in the Brahmin temples of South India who were born untouchables.

In the South Indian State of Travancore (where incidentally, the matriarchal system has prevailed from time immemorial) the Maharaja Martanda Varma, who consolidated the State a century and a half ago, dedicated his kingdom to spiritual purposes, and administered it under the title that has stood first among the accumulated designations of the Rulers of the State—Padmanabhadasa, that is, devotee (dasa) of divinity in the aspect of Vishnu as Creator (Padmanabha). Thus a Kshattriya became both temporal and spiritual head of a kingdom. His successor today has shown that the title and office are neither sentimental nor ornamental. In a proclamation of one hundred and thirty words, the twenty-four-year-old Maharaja Sir Balarama Varma has indicated his spiritual rulership by an act that, in a region hitherto noted for its religious exclusiveness, has eliminated for all time the obstacles that for millennia have barricaded the ancient Vedic vision of the unity of life and the community of its individual and collective forms, and frustrated the social fulfillment of that vision.

The all but unanimous orthodox acceptance of unrestricted entry to the temples of Travancore, and the ready acceptance, by those hitherto shut out of the temples, of regulations to ensure decorum and reverence in worship, are, historically, not a matter for surprise; and the spread of the liberation movement (to some extent anticipated in Gwalior state in Central India which is ruled by the universally minded Gaekwar Maharaja) moves toward an all-India accomplishment. The event has been deplored by a few lay spokesmen of sacredotal vested interests as calculated to deprive temple ceremonial of occult potency which has been maintained by caste purity. Others, an overwhelming majority, have hailed the Proclamation as the most epoch-making event in the history of Hinduism. This may sound an extreme expression of easily awakened sentiment. I see it, in the light of the following circumstances, as an historical fact.

Hinduism is a socio-religious development of the vision of the leaders of a people who awoke to consciousness in northern India in pre-Christian times, and achieved a social organization that recognized both the unity and diversity of humanity, and evolved the four castes of teachers (Brahman); rulers and protectors (Kshattriya); producers and distributors (Vaishya); and servers (Shudra). This served its purpose while the Aryan (noble) group dwelt in its own area. Their spiritual and social doctrine, as expounded in ancient scriptures recently translated into English, has an inherent elasticity that would have stood the destined stretch into the peninsula to include other areas and peoples. But the successors of the Aryan seers lacked both the insight and foresight to provide for the fulfillment of the Vedic vision in expanded circumstances; and the caste system developed rigidities both between and around the castes (and in sub-castes within the castes), and produced the contradiction of the outcaste, called also the pariah, the untouchable, and now the Harijan—Mahatma

---

*Member of the Senate, Academic Council, University of Madras, India.—*Editor.*

Gandhi's term (God's people), coined in order, by giving a dog a good name, to work up an attitude of respect in themselves and others.

Another term widely used when I came to India in 1915 was panchama, fifth caste, a term expressing a desire for inclusion in the Hindu community, and also giving a hint that that desire could be fulfilled through the logical expansion of the Aryan unity to include other participants in the common life. The opening of the temples of Travancore to these extra-Aryans does not, however, simultaneously proclaim their social inclusion; but this is now regarded by some as inevitable, since the religious idea enters into Hindu life to such an extent that the individual of recognized holy pursuits is regarded as having risen beyond the castes and therefore become a freeman of them all. This is the basis of the Brahmin worship of saints who were born untouchable, to which I have already referred.

Seen in this perspective, the Proclamation of the Maharaja of Travancore is, in fact, the most drastic event in the history of Hinduism, since it makes possible the fulfillment of both the spiritual and social implications of the Vedic view of human unity on a scale never previously attempted.

But the event, as I interpret it, is even more drastic than this. The Proclamation not only removes the contradiction of discrimination between one group and the other groups inside the Hindu community, but also removes the discrimination that has existed between the Hindu community and the rest of the world. With unemphatic but invincible logic the doors of the Hindu temple are opened to *all the world*. The concluding words of the Proclamation are: "there should henceforth be no restrictions placed on any Hindu by birth *or religion* on entering or worshipping at the temples controlled by Us and Our Government." There would be no point in distinguishing between one who was a Hindu by birth and one who was a Hindu by religion unless a widening beyond congenital racial Hinduism was intended. I have been given to understand that a westerner who accepts Hinduism as one of the ways whereby humanity can approach Divinity, and Divinity approach humanity, may, on a demonstration of sincerity by conformity with certain simple regulations (bathing, donning Indian garb, putting consecrated ashes on the forehead) enter and participate in the observances of the temples of Travancore on the same level as a born Hindu. This makes the event not only unique in Hindu history but of interest to the large and growing number of westerners who respond to the Hindu view of life, but who have heretofore been debarred from getting the "feel" of Hindu religious observance.

It is evident, therefore, that, by virtue of the Proclamation to which he put his sign manual on November 12, 1936, the young, pious, disciplined, active, intelligent Maharaja of Travancore, whose life is a perpetual dedication to both the spiritual and material welfare of his six million people, takes his place among the immortals of human history. And I may add that the glory which the imagination of Hindu India has already conferred on him is, by common consent, shared by His Highness' high-souled and brilliant mother, Maharani Setu Parvati Bayi, and by his Brahmin Prime Minister (Dewan), Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, a man of capacity, culture, and experience of wide range and of a quality that amounts to genius.

Not Peace at Any Price*

EDITH HUNTER

"This office acceptance is not intended to work the Act anyhow," writes Mahatma Gandhi in an illuminating article in *Harijan* of last month. Many who were working for India's freedom must have felt the depressing influence of the progressive steps of seeming compromise that have been taken during recent months. The price of peace we thought we were willing to pay, but it was difficult to follow the Apostle of Truth through the mists of the latest political maze. But now the clouds are lifting and we begin to discern another lesson in practical peace-making, this time on the political plane—the most difficult of all planes on which to be simple and direct.

Questions crowd to our minds concerning this new Act. First, why should there have been acceptance of office at all, when the Act contained so many pernicious elements? Secondly, why the skirmish after the elections with the resultant deadlock, if it were the intention to take office? And, lastly, why the final compromise?

The answer broadly speaking can be given in Gandhi's own words, concerning his leading of the Congress policy: "It is a serious attempt on the one hand to avoid a bloody revolution and on the other to avoid mass civil disobedience on a scale hitherto not attempted." We may in our haste speak of compromise but the alternative policies would have had appalling results.

Gandhi has been working, as he always does, for constructive peace, but he is under no illusions. He states clearly that the "Act is wholly unsatisfactory to achieve freedom"; further, that "there is great validity in the argument that the Act has left ministers no money to spend for nation-building departments," and he surmises that behind the whole thing there is probably a hope that people will get used to this bad thing and eventually be lulled into liking their bondage.

After facing these undoubted facts, he goes on to exhort his followers to find the best in their opponents, but still definitely to combat any evil frustrations. He says, "try to forget for the moment the crushing limitations of the Act," and he even goes to the length of consenting that "it is possible to construe it as an attempt to replace rule by the sword by rule of majority." It has admittedly enfranchised

*This article by the Honorary Secretary of the English *Friends of India* is a timely and valuable interpretation of Gandhi's recent action in leading Indians to accept office and thus operate the new constitution for India. Gandhi is evidently seeking to win independence *through* the Act rather than *against* the Act—a momentous experiment. —*Editor*.

thirty millions and this in itself gives "wide power," especially "if those who represent the thirty million voters have a faith of their own and are intelligent enough to use the powers (including the holding of offices) placed in their hands." Then follow some practical suggestions for legislative changes which are startling and pre-suppose a definite attitude and outlook on the part of Congress ministers, both as individuals and members of a National party.

Gandhi quotes an "English financier who has held high office in India" as saying

> "the worst legacy we have left to India is a high-grade Service . . . . . whatever is being done today with 'money motive,' should in future be based on 'service motive.' Why should teachers and doctors be paid high salaries? Why cannot most of the work be done on a coöperative basis, which in other words is modified socialism; money would not be needed, at least not in large quantity."

What Gandhi here envisages is a definite attempt to meet this high-grade money service with a moral grade of pure service. Rank and prestige must be met with the utmost simplicity—small pay, simple Khadi dress, third-class traveling and such like. In a word, ministers must be the fitting representatives of the "poorest nation on earth." It is idealistic but the world has seen such workers and may do so again even in the political sphere, but the scheme he envisages goes even further.

Here we find a definite suggestion that the "seven hundred million hands of toilers in India can really be made the working capital for development." This literally means utilizing the human capital instead of money capital. The problem involves helping the villagers to learn to coöperate. This needs first of all the uprooting of the social evils which disintegrate, such as caste and untouchability, but this Gandhi declares is the route and the only route to social and national unity. He suggests as a beginning that education should be made self-supporting and free from its present liquor-revenue support, that jails should be turned into reformatories and workshops, and made self-supporting.

By a political development such as this, one can see that a great moral urge would be created and would come in contact with the existing high-grade Service. Two sets of workers having different ideals and different goals would meet of necessity, and herein is the first step towards the conversion of opponents. This is what Gandhi calls the "non-violent approach." The whole scheme, which in *Harijan* is merely indicated, constitutes a most definite challenge to the modern political world. Can a great moral urge so modify the political machine that war or civil resistance can be avoided? Such a scheme appears to one at first as only "the high that proved too high, the heroic for earth too hard"; must it be so? Is there faith enough to work it? It would seem to depend not only on the leadership of the Mahatma but on whether a great moral ideal like this can grip the imagination of those who call themselves merely political? One cannot be surprised if it should prove too hard. Nevertheless, Gandhi maintains that the Congressmen have already great power because to a considerable extent they carry with them the good will and support of the villages, and if that source of power is developed further, on the moral side, it will become overwhelmingly strong even in the political sphere.

Therefore the first thing to be understood by all, of whatever party, is that there has been no compromise on fundamental principles. The acknowledged aim is complete independence; there should be no doubt about that. It is a non-violent approach but it is not peace at any price. "It may be foolish," says the Mahatma,

> "visionary, impractical, nevertheless it is best that Congressmen, other Indians and Englishmen should know it. This office acceptance is not intended to work the Act anyhow. In the prosecution by the Congress of its goal of complete independence, it is a serious attempt on the one hand to avoid a bloody revolution and on the other to avoid mass civil disobedience on a scale hitherto not attempted. May God bless it."

London, England.

Gandhi's Silent Revolution

HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR*

Gandhi's life may be divided into the following periods: (1) 1869-1893, student life, the period of preparation including the study of law in London. (2) 1894-1914, the period of experimentation with the weapon of non-violence in South Africa for the redress of wrongs done to the Indians in that country. When the cult of violence was in the air and armaments were being piled up by all "civilized" nations, the young Hindu barrister was trying out the truth of the religious maxim: Love thine enemies! (3) 1914-1918, the period of the World War, the period of preparation for Swaraj, for Self-Government, which Gandhi believed would be conferred upon India by Great Britain at the end of the War. (4) 1919-1924, the period of disillusionment and the launching of the non-violent non-coöperation campaign for the attainment of Swaraj, culminating in Gandhi's arrest, trial, and incarceration from 1922 to 1924. (5) 1924-1928, the period of "retirement" from politics, the period of effective organizational work in the villages supervised by Gandhi and his lieutenants. (6) 1929-1932, the period of intensive civil disobedience, Gandhi's imprisonment, his release and participation in the Second Round Table Conference, his re-arrest, his "fast unto death" over the "communal award," and his release. (7) 1932- up to date, the period of silent revolution: Gandhi's whole-hearted work for the uplift of the underprivileged, the so-called "untouchables" whom the Mahatma has re-christened *Harijans,* i.e., "Children of God"; his efforts at rural reconstruction through the revivification of village industries; his successes in the political field, in the recent elections, with the aid of his able lieutenant, Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru, Congress President.

This silent revolution of the last five years is without parallel. It has scored victories in the field of social, economic, and political reconstruction. The British press which had played down Gandhi and his role in 1931 has been stunned by the capture of six out of eleven Provinces by the Congress, i.e., by Gan-

*Extracts from Dr. Muzumdar's address at the Gandhi 68th Birthday Celebration in New York on October 2nd last.—*Editor.*

dhi's Party. The language of the election returns, even the densest of Britishers is capable of understanding. In connection with the inauguration of the India Act of 1935, the British Crown issued an Instrument of Instructions to the Governors of various Provinces. Recently Gandhi issued what may be called an Instrument of Instructions to Congress Ministries, laying down his objectives as well as Congress policies. These objectives are: (1) prohibition of liquor within three years; (2) liquidation of illiteracy; (3) easing of the land revenue burden; (4) moratorium on agricultural debts; (5) improvement of medical and public health and hygiene facilities; (6) scaling down of the salary schedule at the top and raising of the salaries at the bottom of the government services.

This silent revolution of India is working not only for the freedom of India from her own ills and from the ills of foreign rule but it is also striving, through its insistence upon non-violence and love, to lay the true foundation for disarmament and peace, for self-determination and freedom, for "peace on earth and good will among men."

Jawaharlal Nehru

GEORGE LINNAEUS THOMPSON

Not long ago I was seated in an auditorium listening to a speaker who had recently arrived in this country from India. Among the striking things which he said as he talked about affairs in the Orient was this, "The most influential man in the world today is not Mussolini, not Hitler, not Gandhi," (I sat up and listened,) "but Jawaharlal Nehru, a man whose words influence more human beings than any other individual now alive." A half-dozen sun-tanned men, travelers and returned missionaries, who were present, nodded approval.

To me the name conveyed a rather vague meaning associated with articles in magazines and newspapers concerning the All-India Congress. My curiosity was aroused and since then I have been reading everything I could find having to do with this Hindu leader, and talking with persons who know something about him.

The most instructive and illuminating piece of literature I have found concerning him is his autobiography recently published in England. It is a book of six hundred pages, dealing not only with the author's life story, but packed with information concerning Indian affairs.

Nehru is a tall man with a commanding presence and a fine intellectual face. Not only in appearance, but in general temperament, he is the direct antithesis of Gandhi.

Some do not regard him as a true Hindu since his ancestors were Kashmiras who came down from their old home in the Vale of Kashmere in the days of the Great Moguls about two hundred years ago. Jawaharlal was born in 1889 and was educated in India and England. His father was a barrister, a man of wide influence among his countrymen, noted for his sterling character and liberality of views.

Because of his English schooling and early associations with Europeans, Jawaharlal is able to get the British viewpoint better than many of his countrymen. One might term him an oriental with an occidental mind.

He sums up his own character in these words:

> "I have become a queer mixture of the East and West, out of place anywhere, at home nowhere. Perhaps my thought and approach to life are more akin to what is called western than eastern, but India clings to me, as she does to all her children, in innumerable ways, and behind me lie, somewhere in the subconscious, racial memories of a hundred, or whatever the number may be, generations of Brahmins. I cannot get rid of either that past inheritance or my recent acquisitions. They are both a part of me, and, though they help me in both East and West, they also create in me a feeling of spiritual loneliness not only in public activities but in life itself. I am a stranger and an alien in the West. I cannot be of it. But in my own country, also, sometimes I have an exile's feeling."

As a leader he possesses an indefinable something which marks him apart from the herd. The prestige of Brahmin ancestry goes far in India. He has the noble presence which in all countries people admire. He is finely endowed mentally, and his educational advantages have augmented his natural ability. From the western standpoint he is more practical than Gandhi. As an illustration, he views Gandhi's "village industries" with the critical eye of a European. He concedes that the restoration of the spinning wheel and hand-loom has certain values. They employ the hands and minds of the Hindu peasantry at the season when there is no outdoor work. They have the virtue of being traditional Hindu industries. To some extent they emancipate India from dependence upon English factories, but Jawaharlal recognizes the fact that the wheels of progress do not turn backward. This is a machine age. It is impossible even in India to successfully displace or compete with the European factory system.

His attitude toward Gandhi is interesting. He considers Gandhi as a leader of the first rank having unique characteristics. It is Gandhi's personality that distinguishes him from all contemporary world leaders. He does not need the use of compulsion in any form. He can do without the blare and tumult. He leads because he has magnetism which attracts through love, a spiritual power that draws men unto him.

Jawaharlal acknowledges his debt to Gandhi and emulates him in many ways.

He presents an interesting sidelight on Gandhi's appreciation of the aesthetic. He says that Gandhi has little sense of beauty or artistry in man-made objects. The glory of the Taj Mahal has no appeal to him. He looks upon it as a monument to forced labor and a waste of human energy. On the other hand he goes into ecstacies over the beauty of the sunset or the tints of color in flowers. He says that among both British and Indians, Gandhi often suffers from unmerited criticism and misunderstandings because his followers are "framed." Gandhi's enemies pass the word along that it is Gandhi's command or wish that they commit excesses or do some foolish thing. Supposing that they are obeying the Mahatma, they bring discredit to Gandhi and punishment upon themselves.

Sometimes in these days it seems as if the door of a jail is the gate of fame. Among persons who have risen to eminence in public life not a few have had a taste of prison. Jails in any country are not pleasant habitations. Nehru gives us vivid word pictures of his experience in Indian jails. He tells of the animals which are to be found there, enumerating variety enough to stock a museum or zoo. Beside the ordinary vermin which infests all jails, he mentions mice, rats, bats, centipedes, scorpions, wasps, snakes, dogs, monkeys, birds and squirrels.

Once his jail sentence was embittered by seeing his old mother brutally beaten by the native police.

One of the things which troubles him is being the object of hero worship which seems to be an ingrained trait of Hindu character. There is no doubt that he is immensely popular. He has become a national hero. The intelligentsia lionize him. The masses worship him. Songs have been written about him. Legends are growing up about his deeds. Curiously enough his enemies not only respect him but sometimes praise him. Among his own people he is given credit for practising renunciation which is considered as a great merit. One of the titles given him is, "The embodiment of sacrifice."

Some of these stories are so absurd that they greatly trouble him. For example, those who would magnify his personal wealth and fastidiousness affirm that he regularly sends his laundry to Paris.

Another popular legend is that while in England he went to school with the Prince of Wales (now the Duke of Windsor), and that when the prince visited India he immediately inquired where he might find Jawaharlal Nehru.

He tersely states his own reaction to all this praise and adulation. "My reputation as a hero is entirely a bogus one, and I do not feel at all heroic, and generally the heroic attitude or dramatic pose in life strikes me as silly." Again he says, "Conceit, like fat on the human body, grows imperceptibly, layer upon layer, and the person whom it affects is unconscious of the daily accretion."

Few persons, native or foreign, analyze Indian affairs as he does. He clearly shows that much of the unrest in India is due to fear, stupidity and brutality on the part of the British rulers. The student of history cannot escape observing the deadly parallel between this rule and that of the old Romans over their conquered subjects. He clearly shows how inhuman punishments and repressions make terrorists, and how naturally inoffensive persons are being imbued with ideas of violence.

A contemplative person reading Nehru's book realizes that Hindus like Gandhi, Nehru, and others of their kind, are doing something which perhaps they do not fully realize. They are conquering their masters by ideas and example. They are creating a sentiment among Englishmen which will make colonial tyranny impossible in the not far distant future.

The question is often asked: What are the political views held by this leader who could precipitate three hundred million human beings on the side which he favored in a great world struggle? At the present time he is a moderate Socialist more inclined to seek independence and freedom for his people than to promote any political or economic philosophy. He states that he is coming to favor Communism more and more because it holds promise for a better world.

He says that he differs from Gandhi in two things. Gandhi praises poverty. He believes that poverty has no place in modern life. Gandhi believes in salvation through the individual. He believes in social salvation.

He seems to deprecate violence less from conscientious scruples than from a clear perception that it is an out-dated, futile method of obtaining good results. He works patiently while the legions thunder past.

He is now nearly fifty years old. It is probable that the mantle of Gandhi will fall upon him, not only because he has attained a place of leadership, but because it is the will of the Indian people and the wish of Gandhi. He already has more power than the Mahatma and his one ambition is to help Mother India.

Our Brethren the Trees

MIRA

Gandhiji wanted to card some cotton and make slivers before going to bed, even though it was getting late. I went to make the bow, etc., ready, and being in a hurry, I asked a local volunteer to fetch me from the garden some *babul* tree leaves, which one requires for applying to the gut of the bow.

The boy brought me a large bunch, and, as he handed it to me, I was surprised to notice that each little leaf was tightly folded up.

I took them to Gandhiji's room. "Do you see, Bapu," I said, "the little leaves have all gone to sleep!"

"Of course," replied Gandhiji, looking up with indignation and pity in his eyes. "Trees are living beings just like ourselves. They live and breathe, they feed and drink as we do, and like us they need sleep. It is a wretched thing to go and tear the leaves off a tree at night when it is resting! And why have you brought such a huge quantity. Only a few leaves were necessary. Surely you heard what I said at the meeting yesterday about the poor flowers, and how deeply it pains me that people should pluck those masses of delicate blossoms to fling in my face and hang around my neck. Was not it thoughtless to send some one out like that to worry and pain a tree at such a late hour when it had folded its leaves in sleep? We should feel a more living bond between ourselves and the rest of animate creation."

"Yes, Bapu, I know—I understand," said I, hanging my head in shame. "It was very thoughtless of me. In future I will always go myself, and I will endeavor never again unnecessarily to disturb the peaceful sleep of the trees by plucking at their foliage after dark."

And I felt doubly ashamed of myself, as many and many a time have I gained comfort and guidance from our forest brethren. Often have I put my arms round the trunk of an old mighty tree and listened to his hushed words of wisdom and peace.

How could I have been so heartless!

—*Young India.*

For Neutrality and Against Isolation*

A. J. MUSTE

The overwhelming majority of the American people today are convinced that the best way for the United States to serve its own interests and those of other nations and peoples is to keep out of any foreign wars. Congress has in part implemented that conviction of the American people by passing the Neutrality Act. The Act provides that when a state of civil or international war exists in any part of the world, the President shall so proclaim. Thereupon we refuse to sell arms or to make loans to either warring party. We tell American citizens not to travel on the vessels of the warring nations. The President has a right to require that belligerents shall, before shipment, take title to any goods bought by them, so that they have to suffer any loss resulting from the state of war. He also has the right to issue a list of commodities other than arms which American vessels may not carry to belligerents.

The President has so far not invoked the Neutrality Act in the Chinese-Japanese war. In his Chicago speech, the President proposed a course which many informed persons interpret as diverging from the policy behind the Neutrality Act. He hinted at a policy which would have the United States act in concert with some nations, against other nations regarded as aggressors. He spoke of a "quarantine" against these aggressors, treaty-violating nations. Experience shows that this means "economic sanctions"—you deprive one nation of supplies that it needs to wage war, and thus try to stop it or to assure victory for the other, presumably innocent, nation. Experience also shows that the so-called "aggressor" nation is not likely to take kindly to such action and so you are gradually drawn into war against it.

The law being what it is, it is the President's solemn duty to invoke the Neutrality Act in the Chinese-Japanese war and to see to it that we sell no arms and make no loans to either Japan or China. All of us ought to bombard the President and our Congressmen with demands that the law be enforced—the clearly expressed will of the people carried out.

But that does not dispose of the question whether the Neutrality Act should be altered or repealed, whether we ought to follow some other course as a nation than that of keeping out of any foreign war, and make it clear to the world that that is what we intend to do.

It is my firm conviction that we must not evade or repeal the Neutrality Act, but enforce and strengthen it; and that for our own and humanity's sake we must stick to our determination not to get into any foreign war.

Bitter and costly experience backs up that lesson. In 1917 we were drawn into a war between so-called autocratic, aggressive nations and the so-called democratic and peace-loving. (Czarist Russia was among these supposedly democratic ones!) So far as the great mass of Americans were concerned we went into that war for the sake of humanity and to make the world safe for democracy. Directly and indirectly the Great War cost 30 million human lives and 400 billion dollars worth of wealth. That is a lot of money to use in trying out any theory or method.

When the war was over, we learned we had actually been fighting to help Great Britain and France hold their colonies against the Central Powers; to save the loans of our bankers; to try to escape a depression from the collapse of the armament boom after we had got our industries all geared up to making goods for the Allies. Democracy was not saved but raped.

Did we do anybody in Europe a favor by our intervention in the Great War? Nobody, except perhaps the munitions makers and some financiers and the dictators-to-be. Suppose we had stuck to the purpose of the American people when Wilson was elected in November, 1916, on the slogan, "He kept us out of war." It would take a very smart man with a lot of nerve to make a plausible argument for the position that Europe would have been any worse off than it has been. Actually, if we had not been duped into the war, the European powers would have been in a stalemate. They would have been forced to make some adjustment about colonies, markets, raw materials. They could not have put over the vengeful Treaty of Versailles which begat a brood of dictators. There might be a United States of Europe today and a genuine League of Nations or Peoples, instead of chaos and hell.

Let us think twice, yes ten times, in the light of that experience before we decide that we are going to help the Chinese most by intervention, economic or military, in the present conflict. Our intentions are good. But hell is paved with such intentions. Suppose we and perhaps other nations join China in a war, and China wins and becomes the France, and Japan the Germany, of the Pacific—who will benefit by that? Certainly not the people of China or Japan.

But, some people exclaim, "To keep neutral, not to sell arms to either belligerents, means isolation." One answer to that emotional reaction is, What of it? We do not have to let any one bulldoze us by shouting words. Let us face realities. From war we do want to isolate ourselves and our children. I am no more ashamed of that than of wanting to isolate my children from typhoid. True, something more has to be done to check the ravages of typhoid than seeking to isolate one's own children, else even they are not in the long run safe. But there is nothing to be ashamed of, morally or intellectually, in isolating them as long and as much as possible. The same goes for war.

But as a matter of fact we want neutrality, precisely because we do not want isolation. If we take the position of not selling arms either to China or to Japan, we remain in contact with both; there is a chance that our appeals for peace may be heard. We can then participate as we should in conferences with the signatories of the Nine Power Treaty or others to seek adjustment of the issues by all peaceful means. The minute we cut off munitions to Japan and then make profit out of selling munitions to China, we are isolated from Japan. We have in fact declared war, even though we too may be hypocritical and not do so in words. We must break out of the isolation—nationalism, tariff walls as high as heaven, currency wars—which is the aftermath of war, into the commerce and fraternity which are possible only on the basis of a peace and disarmament policy.

But must we not assume responsibility to stop

*A radio address delivered at Station WEVD, New York. The author is minister of the Labor Temple in New York City.—*Editor.*

the aggressor? Yes. And then we have to ask, "Who is the aggressor?" And from Japan's point of view—and must we not admit from a common-sense viewpoint—Great Britain, which seized and now holds India, which holds Hongkong right off the Chinese coast, which has troops in Shanghai, which has recently spent millions fortifying the naval base of Singapore, is the aggressor in Asia. France which seized and now holds Indo-China, which likewise has troops on Chinese soil, is the aggressor. The United States which fought Spain ostensibly to give independence to the Philippines and then itself subdued the Filipinos in a cruel war, which has naval bases in the Aleutian Islands and in the Philippines (a line drawn between them runs through Japan) is the aggressor in the Pacific. Suppose Great Britain, France and Japan had carved out slices of Canada and Latin America; then suppose that Japan had naval bases in British Columbia and Central America and Chile, and excluded Americans from Asia as an inferior breed, and that we were seeking to secure our markets and access to raw materials somewhere in South America, and that Japan assumed an air of moral superiority and called us "aggressors," would we not indignantly deny it and call her a hypocrite?

Yes, we must do something to defend the Chinese people, and the Japanese people; we must do something honest and positive about aggressors.

Such things as this we must do:

Enforce the Neutrality Act at once and make no profit out of sales of munitions to either Japan or China.

Repeal the Japanese Exclusion Act.

Take our marines out of China and our war-vessels out of Chinese waters.

Then we shall be in a moral position to insist upon the calling of a world-economic conference to see that nations like Japan have access to raw materials on something like an equitable basis, and the terminating of a tariff and currency policy which is strangling the economic life of all nations.

Let progressives and peace-lovers in the United States work for democracy and against Fascism here—let us have a great campaign for social security, against private munitions manufacturing, against our own big navy program, against lynching, against anti-Semitism, here at home. We really cannot expect to gain respect, for example, for a Japanese boycott resolution by an A. F. of L. convention which supports the Japanese Exclusion Act and refuses to do anything about discrimination against Negroes in its own unions.

Let us demand that President Roosevelt define clearly his foreign policy. Let him assure us that the whispers that he made his Chicago speech as a build-up for a big armament program to take up the present slack in production are not true. We do not want another President, no matter how liberal and well-intentioned he may be, who under the slogan, "He kept us out of war," leads us step by step to the brink of another war.

To set our faces like flint against that will take courage. But if we do it, then in some great sense America will become the hope of the world.

Partition of Palestine

TARAKNATH DAS

The tragedy of partitioning Palestine has the same type of realities as the partition of Ireland by the British Imperialists. Apparently, dividing the Holy Land into three sections—a British mandate over Jerusalem, a highly important strategic centre; a small Jewish State within the British Empire; and an incorporation of a part of Palestine with the Arab State of Transjordan—will serve three distinct purposes. By this process, Britain will not lose military control over Palestine; she will be able to use the Jewish world, and above all will be able to please at least a very large section of the Moslem World.

Britain does not cherish any love for the Arabs or Palestinian Moslems, who are at the present time encouraged by some important European (Mediterranean) Power to revolt against Britain. In fact, Britain can trust the Jews better, because the latter will not take a stand against the British Empire where they enjoy complete civil rights and the least of racial discrimination. Yet Britain, to please the Moslems in India and other parts of the British Empire and countries adjoining India, has made a pro-Arab settlement in partitioning Palestine.

The Moslem population under the British rule is about 100,000,000. India has no less than 75,000,000 Moslems; Egypt 14,000,000; Arabia 6,500,000; Iraq 500,000; Transjordan 300,000; Borneo 200,000; and Penang 146,000. Furthermore, Britain must think of 15,000,000 Turks, 14,000,000 Iranians (Persians), and about 10,000,000 Afghans who may be used by British statesmen to further British imperial interests.

India has the largest Moslem population in any country in the world and the policy of Great Britain is to make concessions to this powerful minority to win their aid in keeping India in subjection. Maintenance of British rule over India is the cardinal principle of British diplomacy, and control of Palestine and the route to India is only a means to the central policy. So long as India remains under British control, Britain will try to have direct or indirect supremacy over the Middle East—the region between the Suez and India.

It seems that for the present the Jews will have to accept the British program of partition of Palestine, because that is the best they can now get from the British who are determined to please the Arabs at the cost of the Jews; and at the same time the League of Nations' Mandate Commission will certainly support the British program of partition of Palestine. But this may not be a final solution. Poland was partitioned by the concert of German, Austrian, and Russian empires. These empires have vanished and a new Poland—an Imperialist Poland—has come into existence as the result of the World War! The Jewish people, like the Hindus, have survived several thousand years. Let us hope that they will not only survive, but glorify their existence by their contributions to human progress, while grasping empires may vanish and perish in oblivion.

Japanese Honor Great Americans

W. B. BULLEN

The intense patriotism of the Japanese is known by all the world. It has recently been pointed out that contact with western cultural ideas has had the effect of bringing out contrasting traditional customs and practices and interests, defining and developing them, so that some of the ancient arts have reached unprecedented national favor and the most general pursuit ever known.

Furthermore, in the last few years there has been a marked reaction in Japan against foreign ways and against internationalism. Countless ultranationalistic organizations, some of them enrolling huge numbers, have sprung up throughout the land, which hark back to ancient ideas and seek to rebuild the national life on the basis of old-time Japanese principles. Indeed, among a people so quick mentally, so facile, so ready, and withal so sentimental, those accustomed to study social phenomena would expect to observe an unusual ebb and flow of interest and emotion. It is not to be supposed, however, that such fluctuations of mood will destroy the open-mindedness and the vivid interest in novel values, wherever appearing, which have been historically a marked Japanese trait. Nor is it reasonable to anticipate that the extraordinary capacity of the Japanese to take over and adapt foreign objects, ideas, and institutions will ever fall completely into abeyance.

It is a lamentable fact that important features of the policy of the American nation and of some of its constituent sovereign states have not only played into the hands of Japanese anti-foreignism and jingoism, but have both wounded the sensibilities and excited the apprehensions of liberal and generous spirits. Among these actions are the denial by American representatives at the Versailles Conference of the earnest Japanese desire that the principle of racial equality should be recognized in the treaty being prepared; discriminatory state legislation regarding schools as well as the holding and the leasing of land; proposed maintenance, even after the Philippines become independent, of a naval base off the eastern coast of Asia; naval maneuvers as near Japanese waters as practicable; and the big navy program.

In view of the facts thus frankly recognized, the attitude of Japanese, both individually and officially, toward certain great Americans becomes highly interesting. Under the centralized government of modern Japan, public school courses are standardized, and the same text-books are used throughout the country. There is a series of readers designed specifically for ethical instruction and character-building. How interested I was in my early studies as a missionary to Japan to come upon the story of George Washington and his hatchet! Not only was the account written in the usual attractive style, but the little chap's offense was more startling in Japan than here because of the special fondness for the cherry blossoms. What worse thing could the boy have done with his hatchet than cut down his father's beloved *cherry* tree? For another reason the story was more impressive there than here. Japanese ideas of the relative importance of the various recognized virtues are not the same as ours. Gentleness, humility, subordination of self, courtesy, sympathy, delicate considerateness of others' feelings are more highly rated and far better practised by Japanese than by westerners, especially, perhaps, Americans. But not so with forthrightness, straightforwardness, rectitude, downright honesty, and strict truthfulness. Practice of these difficult virtues may have grown lax among us, but at least we plainly see their claims on men. Polytheism indeed tends to confuse morality. Clear-cut, sharply defined moral distinctions are not to be expected where there is not common belief in one holy God.

A Japanese boy, realizing the damage he had done, would be disposed to say anything he could think of rather than own up to destroying his father's cherry tree. But George in those very circumstances promptly and unhesitatingly told his father the plain truth! In the central part of Japan, a Christian student in the government commercial college told me that the cherry tree story gave him his first realization of the imperious obligation of veracity.

Until after the restoration of the Emperor in 1868, the people were graded in social classes, and the Samurai held all the honors and privileges. Japan's traditions accordingly are aristocratic. With such standards how would Abraham Lincoln fare? Of such lowly origin, could he ever win a high place in Japanese esteem? And yet he did. It was my thoroughly confirmed impression that among the young people of Japan, in their period of hero-worship and also later, no foreign character had such a powerful appeal as the rail-splitter, the great emancipator. It is possible that such is not the case today. Until recent years liberalism was steadily advancing toward the control it was still far from attaining. Now indeed it is in disfavor and is calumniated by numerous spokesmen. But the former liberalism of Japanese students and teachers was a striking demonstration of independence of thought, and such independence, though now repressed, is not crushed.

Now we come to a Japanese honoring of American heroes which will, I think, amaze many readers. The religion prevalent in Japan before Buddhism and Confucianism entered the country, was Shintoism which during the periods of Buddhist predominance has always exerted a strong opposing and corrective influence. Shintoism derives its infinite number of divinities from nature with its vital forces and from the great men of Japan. When its adherents emigrate to foreign lands, Shintoism does not consider them lost to the national faith and expect them to take up a new religion in the new land. In parts of California, for instance, where Japanese are numerous, there have been set up not only temples of the universalistic religion, Buddhism, but shrines of the nationalistic religion, Shintoism. In the home country, Shintoism is in a new phase of activity, and in the United States it is seeking to adapt and establish itself.

In old Japan, the loyalty of a retainer to his feudal lord was limitless. But it should be noted that the propriety of a man's transference from one clan to another was recognized. To the new lord, loyalty was to be complete. While Germany and Italy have made certain claims of perpetual hold on their emigrants abroad, the logic of Japanese tradition and feeling pre-

scribes a whole-hearted transfer of devotion to the new country. Those Japanese who have cast their lot in with this land are disposed, I am fully satisfied, to render full allegiance here. Even the fact that naturalization of Japanese is not as yet permitted does not reverse their sentiments nor prevent their fidelity to the United States. The immigrants are permanently settled here, they approve American ideals, and like American ways; the children are American by birth and from birth, and the family regards itself as American.

The Shinto leaders, indisposed to cut off and cast adrift their believers who have settled in this country, recognize the great change in these persons' interests and attachments. The religion must then make adjustment to this situation and in some fashion naturalize itself here. There must be American great men for American Shintoists to revere. Including innumerable gods already, the elastic pantheon may without any strain admit a few more. Who can in practice heed more than a few divinities out of billions? So it has become the policy of Shintoism in a slow, dignified, fashion to elevate great Americans to divine status. The Roman Catholic Church has by canonization made some surprising additions at times to its roster of saints. Less strange is it that among the Japanese divinities are now enrolled certain suitable Americans. Of such immortality George Washington and Abraham Lincoln were assured.

Study Table

For Students of Indian Affairs

LANCER AT LARGE. *By Major F. Yeats-Brown. 323 pp. New York: Viking Press. $2.75.*

When Major F. Yeats-Brown wrote his book *The Lives of a Bengal Lancer,* Hugh Walpole wrote: "We are the richer for it, the wiser for it . . . we have shared his fine adventure." I may say that the author's *Lancer at Large* is a work which has a greater appeal for students of Indian affairs. At the outset, it may be remarked that Major Yeats-Brown is not concerned about Indian political independence from the British rule. In fact he is one of the few far-sighted British statesmen (in the broad sense of the word) who feel that Great Britain, in the long run, would need Indian support as much as India now needs British coöperation in the reconstruction of the country. He thinks that the Indian nationalists minimize the importance of the problem of Indian national defense. He frankly says that unless the Indian people prove themselves able to control Indian National Defense, it would not be wise for them to have independence. No one, with any sense of reality, will disagree with the British officer; but the Indian nationalists would argue with him and others to the effect that the British Government's policy has rendered the people of India incapable of assuming the full responsibility of national defense. Mr. Yeats-Brown points out that a beginning has been made in training Indian officers in the Indian Military Academy; but it will take years to accomplish the desired end. Impressions of the students of the Indian Military Academy at Dehra Dun, as given by Mr. Yeats-Brown, show that India does not lack the material for first-class officers. The author says: "These [Indian] cadets are a magnificent body of young men; and the British officers with whom they mix in after-life tell me that they are equal to Sandhurst cadets in every way." Mr. Yeats-Brown thinks that "communal tension" is the greatest stumbling block in the way of India's progress.

This British officer who lived in India for a great many years, during his recent visit to the country which he sincerely loves saw tremendous changes for the good. Indians are laboring for the regeneration of the country through constructive works of various kinds, and there is no reason to believe that the march of progress can be stopped.

Mr. Yeats-Brown is deeply interested in the spiritual side of Indian life; he has explored Indian religious life, and has sought to understand something of the mysteries of Yoga. He is convinced that India has much to give to the world and that the West should coöperate with India, so that her contributions may make the world richer in the spiritual values of life.

The book is not an essay on moral philosophy, nor is it a book of travel. It is far from a treatise on social and political changes in India, yet it has fascinating contents embracing the life and labor in India. It is at the same time a subtle appeal to the British for sympathetic understanding of what India is and what her people are striving to attain and to give to the world.

Mr. Yeats-Brown has tried to understand Mother India in a more wholesome spirit than did an American sister a few years ago. One may disagree with some of the conclusions of the author; but one must recognize his sincerity. The book is written in any easy style and will help many Americans to understand present-day India and her possible future.

TARAKNATH DAS.

Anthologies of the Spirit

INNER LIGHT, A DEVOTIONAL ANTHOLOGY.—*First Series compiled by M. Catherine Albright and Others. New York: The Macmillan Company, $1.75.*

Second Series compiled by Mrs. Leyton Richards. New York: The Macmillan Company. $1.75.

I never tire of reading and using anthologies. I have scores of anthologies on my library shelves—poetry, prose, biblical, devotional—but each new volume that appears is a fresh occasion of excitement and delight.

These volumes, beautifully designed and printed, are of rare worth. Fine literary appreciation, true spiritual sensitivity, and an exquisite sense of proportion and perspective went into their editorial preparation. The first volume, published in England in 1931, found immediate and wide acceptance. It is not surprising that a second volume has now appeared, with a different editor, but the same general plan, and equally successful.

The plan is simple—to take an ethical or spiritual theme, and devote a page, or at the most two pages, to quotations on this theme. The quotations, chosen from the noblest literary and religious sources, are never long, sometimes only a single line, are poetry quite as much as prose, sometimes stories or parables told for their own sake. Usually the first selection in each case is scriptural, frequently the closing selection is a prayer. There are a few hymns, but only a few.

If there is any difference between the first series and the second, it is in the extension of the subjects chosen from the devotional and ethical field to the social. The first volume has pages on "War and Peace" and "Peace on Earth," even "the League of Nations," but the second volume has whole sections, with numerous subheads, on "Human Relationships" and "The Social Order." The two series are therefore not so much duplicative as supplementary.

The sources most frequently quoted in the first volume are Thomas à Kempis, Robert Browning, Henry Drummond, Emerson, George Herbert, Christina Rossetti, Rabindranath Tagore, Wordsworth, the Book of Common Prayer, and, curiously, W. C. Braithwaite. In the second volume, à Kempis again, William Blake, Robert Browning, George Eliot, E. M. Forster, John Milton, W. E. Orchard, Tagore, Evelyn Underhill, and Baron Von Hügel. It is good to note a hymn by Frederick L. Hosmer, with proper acknowledgments to the Unity Publishing Company.

These two lovely little books may well be described as modern Scripture. They should be in pulpits and in homes, and be read reverently in both places.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Selected Readings from the Bible

HIGH HERITAGE. *Compiled by Mary Chapin White. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. $2.00.*

This volume contains some two hundred readings, gathered under various carefully chosen topics, from the Old and New Testaments, and the Apocrypha. The selections are based on the reverent conviction that the Bible is a treasure house of wisdom based on age-old experience of life. God, man and his fellowman, man with himself and his individual problems are the three opening sections of the book, followed by groups of poems and stories, episodes from the life of Christ, and a concluding survey of the "background material" of scripture.

The passages, mostly brief—some of them too brief—are chosen with fine taste and clear discernment of aim and purpose. The primary thought throughout is the need of the individual soul amid the chances and changes, and myriad perplexities of life. To offer help at the moment of trouble—counsel that will guide, comfort that will console, light in darkness, wisdom in folly and rash behavior, strength in weakness and courage in disaster—this is what this book was designed to do. Words that have lived for ages because so beautiful and true, stories long since immortal, poems and passages long ranked with the great literature of all time, and many short, pithy and often neglected sentences and verses of strange cogency and mystic power, these are all here in a kind of breviary of the spirit. One is amazed anew, as one runs through these pages, at the miracle of the Bible, its answer for every problem, its trumpet call to faith and vision "in the thousand spiritual battles with which [man] is faced."

A secondary thought in the compilation of this volume has been that of young people in our schools and colleges, and also in our churches. Here is material for services of worship and for teaching in Sunday schools, and an excellent list of suggested readings for national and religious days commemorated in the school and church year. Ministers will find here a rich collection of texts and quotations for homiletical use.

We call this a first-class piece of editing. Our guess is that, once this book is read and loved, the Bible will be more highly valued and more often used. Perhaps this book will serve no finer purpose than that of persuading persons to turn to the Book again.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The New Testament

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. *By Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake. New York: Harper & Bros.*

Another of Harvard's courses is going down to fame. This time, it is English 35 which for some years has been Professor Lake's course in English Bible. And let it here be noted that Harvard was one of the first colleges to recognize the fact that the great litera-

(*Continued on page* 84)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor

UNITY

Curtis W. Reese
Managing Editor

Introducing UNITY to new readers, we offer a trial subscription of . . .

6 MONTHS for $1.00

A Journal of Free and Critical Opinion

Published semi-monthly. Regular subscription $3.00.

UNITY
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago

Please enter my subscription for a trial period of six months, for which I enclose $1.00.

Name ..... Street .....

City ..... State .....

Study Table

(*Continued from page* 83)

ture of the world cannot be understood apart from biblical literature. Other colleges and universities are now taking the hint and thereby producing more exact and intelligent teachers of literature.

At last Professor Lake, together with the help of his wife, has put flesh on the skeleton of his English 35 and has written this Introduction. Although intended for college and seminary students, this book cannot be neglected by the most scholarly teachers and ministers. It is brought up to date as regards important findings in the field in other languages, especially German. In the main, this Introduction follows the traditional order: the first part presents the important literary and critical parts concerned with the Gospels, Acts, the Pauline Epistles, and the remaining books. But the second part, made significant by Professor Lake's earlier investigations, gives the Jewish-Gentile background against which the New Testament must be seen to be understood.

C. A. HAWLEY.

Correspondence

New Deal or Third Party?

Editor of UNITY:

No, the New Deal is *not* done for. A new party, of the Farmer-Labor type, is highly desirable, and bound to emerge sooner or later, but, alas, later than many of us would like. Political habits and traditions die hard.

Realistic students of politics do not expect any third party of consequence by 1940. But you are unduly pessimistic in predicting an overwhelming reaction against the New Deal. No such reaction is in sight. If the Republicans elect the next President, he and they will be forced by circumstances to continue the New Deal—to meet the demands of the farmers, of organized labor, of the unemployed, and the little fellows in business menaced by the great monopolies. The clock cannot be turned back; the American people will not tolerate a Tory or Bourbon government, a government callous to suffering and committed to the support of the privileged and selfish.

Despite many mistakes, and despite the conservatism of the South, the duty of liberals and progressives is to work and fight for Roosevelt's humane philosophy and for the New Deal program as a whole. The next Congress must be pro-Roosevelt, and the chances are that it will be. The reactionaries have no platform and no leader. Roosevelt has accomplished much, and will accomplish more before the end of his term, provided all enlightened progressives stand by him and see to it that plutocratic and reactionary Democratic senators and representatives are consigned to the obscurity they richly deserve. This can be done. There is no evidence that the masses are deserting Roosevelt. Even those he has lost will have no alternative but to return to his camp. However, we must continue to *advocate* a political realignment and the gradual building up of a third and genuinely liberal party.

Chicago. VICTOR S. YARROS.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 70)

tunately Indian Christians also took their cue from the missionaries and generally kept aloof from the movement. But the sincerity of the leaders of the Congress in advocating prohibition is beyond question. Its adoption is going to involve serious loss of revenue for the Governments for which the Congress Ministries are responsible.

The difficulties in the way of introducing prohibition are stupendous. But the difficulties are there only to be overcome by determined and sustained effort. The undoubted public support there is in India for the total abolition of drink—including, I believe, that of the majority of Christian Indians—will enable the Congress Ministries to overcome these difficulties. The poorer classes in the villages, including Christians, need protection more than any other group of people from the temptations of drink now placed before them. Indian villages will have new life and prosperity when drink is abolished. The Christian Indian community, along with other communities, stands to gain immensely by this measure.

Whatever may be the national habits and traditions of the missionaries from the West in regard to drink, we may trust that their sense of practical wisdom will lead them to adopt a neutral attitude on this question, if they are unable to give active support to the cause of prohibition. But Christian Indians who love India and care for the real welfare of the rural masses cannot but rejoice at the prospect of prohibition in the six Provinces. They should not have any difficulty in wholeheartedly coöperating with their fellow-countrymen in making prohibition a complete success."

And Rev. A. Ralla Ram, General Secretary of the Student Christian Movement of India, Burma and Ceylon, writes:

"I give my full support to the objective of the Congress to bring about complete prohibition in the country and that those who are asking that we should be satisfied with temperance should not be listened to. In my opinion the Europeans who come to this country should fall in with our aspirations, and I am afraid that if we should respect their feelings in this matter, we shall leave a loophole for many others."

As I have said before it is for Europeans to make the choice. I know how difficult it is for them to give up a habit of a life-time, considered respectable. But if they will fall in with the great national reform, the incentive should prove strong enough to wean them from the habit. Anyway, even if in the end exemption within well-defined limits has to be given, let us hope that they will be graceful enough to taboo alcohol from their parties and banquets. Exemption, if any, will be a concession to a lifelong habit and not to a weakness or to an extravagance—*Harijan* (India).

Jawaharlal Nehru on Despatch of Indian Troops to China

The despatch of Indian troops to Shanghai by the British Government is a matter of the gravest import and concern to India. This has been done in continuation of the old policy of using Indian troops abroad without any reference to the wishes of the Indian people. That policy has been condemned by the Congress, which has declared emphatically that India cannot permit her armies and peoples to be exploited to her own disadvantage and for the benefit of British imperialism.

It is stated that Indian troops have been sent to Shanghai to protect Indian interests there. What these Indian interests are few people seem to know, and it is manifest that the interests to be protected are British imperial interests. And even if Indian interests have to be protected, it is for the Indian people to decide what steps should be taken.

The Congress has repeatedly warned us of the danger of war and declared its opposition to the participation of India in any imperialist war. This was no empty warning but a declaration made after full consideration of the grave issues involved. By that declaration and warning the Congress stands.

Therefore, India must protest against this despatch of troops to China. In the Far-Eastern conflict our sympathies are inevitably with China, and we wish her people success in maintaining their freedom against imperialist aggression. But in this international game we cannot allow our man power and resources to be used as pawns by others. Today we can protest only, but that protest will have the full strength of the Congress behind it if this policy continues.

—*India Bulletin.*